

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was discussed that a 101 rejection would be made since the claimed method of enhancing game play does not require that the method be implemented by a particular machine nor transforms a particular article. Applicant will amend the claims to clarify that the method is performed by a processor of a gaming machine. Furthermore, it was discussed that the claims appears to read on a bonus game because the claim does not specify how the promotional award is received, and the claims fails to clarify that the enhanced game state refers to the base game. Claim language was discussed to clarify that a base game is altered so an enhanced based game is played instead of a bonus game.

Update

Supplemental interviews were made on 1/7/10-1/8/10 to discuss proposed amendments. It was discussed that the Newprom award (as indicated in the Specification) is issued by a first gaming machined and received from player by a second gaming machine. A central processor of the second gaming machine determines the whether the Newprom award is applicable. A "base" game is altered so that the "base" game is played with game enhancements. Furthermore, it was discussed that the claim limitation of, "the at least one base game is played with the one or more game play enhancements" will further clarify that the base game is played instead of the bonus game. The claim limitation of "initiating play of a different game" will be amended to "change in a game play, game format, game style or game type of the at least one base game", to clarify that there's a change in how the base game is played or there's a change to the game format, game style or game type of the base game (according to description of Applicant's specification) rather than initiating a different game such as initiating a bonus game. Applicant's representative authorized the examiner to make the appropriate amendments in an examiner's amendment.